

506(c) offerings since the rule's effectiveness in 2013 (Table 13). Approximately 60% more investors participated in non-fund Rule 506(c) offerings than in fund offerings using general solicitation. The average number of investors per Rule 506(c) offering (12) is smaller than the average number of investors in a Rule 506(b) offering (15). This could be correlated with smaller amount of capital being raised, on average, in a Rule 506(c) offering, relative to a Rule 506(b) offering. But Rule 506(c) offerings by fund issuers have a similar number of investors, on average, as a Rule 506(b) fund offering. The median numbers are similarly much smaller than average number of investors in both Rule 506(c) and Rule 506(b) offerings.

Table 13. Investors in Rule 506(c) market: September 23, 2013 - December 31, 2017

	Total number of investors	Mean investors per offering	Median investors per offering		
	All new offerings	All new offerings	New offerings that report investors	All new offerings	New offerings that report investors
Rule 506(c)	82,302	12	18	2	7
Funds	29,681	19	28	4	15
Non-Funds	52,621	9	16	1	5
Rule 506(b)	1,298,470	15	18	4	7
Funds	432,988	17	25	3	8
Non-Funds	865,482	14	16	5	6

g. The Role of Financial Intermediaries in the Regulation D market

While financial intermediaries commonly underwrite public offerings, there is relatively little information about intermediary participation in private offerings. One possible role for an intermediary in a private offering is to help issuers locate potential investors without violating the ban on general solicitation, a constraint of the traditional Rule 506 offerings. Using a pre-existing and substantive relationship between the intermediary and potential investors is one method for the issuer to ensure that there was no general solicitation and preserve the Rule 506(b) safe harbor.

Information collected from Form D filings reveals that intermediaries are used relatively infrequently in the Regulation D market. Only about 21% of new offerings by fund issuers during the period 2009-2017 use an intermediary such as a finder or broker-dealer (Table 14),

while for non-fund issuers use an intermediary in approximately 20% of new offerings.⁵² The data in Table 11 suggests a time trend in the use of intermediaries. Both fund and non-fund issuers experienced a decrease in the use of intermediaries from 2009 to 2017. For example, the use of intermediaries by non-fund issuers declined from approximately 23% in 2009 to approximately 19% in 2017.

Table 14. Use of financial intermediaries and average total fees paid by year, 2009-2017.

Year	Use of Financial Intermediaries		Average Total Fees paid	
	Fund	Non-Fund	Fund	Non-Fund
2009	21.4%	23.3%	2.5%	5.8%
2010	22.3%	22.6%	2.4%	5.6%
2011	24.3%	21.1%	2.0%	5.5%
2012	20.4%	19.9%	2.0%	5.6%
2013	22.7%	19.9%	2.2%	5.5%
2014	18.8%	18.6%	1.6%	5.5%
2015	19.7%	18.6%	1.5%	5.2%
2016	19.0%	18.9%	2.1%	5.2%
2017	21.1%	19.3%	2.4%	5.5%
2009-2017	20.9%	20.0%	2.1%	5.5%

When an intermediary is used, there is significant variation in the fees between fund and non-fund issuers. We calculate the total fee for an offering as the sum of commission and finder's fees, scaled by the offering amount. Information from Form D filings reveals that the total fee paid by fund issuers is on average approximately 2% during the covered period (Table 14). On the other hand, non-fund issuers pay more than twice that amount: their average fee is approximately 5.5%. Differences in offering and issuer characteristics most likely account for the significant difference.

The use of intermediaries also varies significantly by issuer type (Figure 18). Issuers from the real estate industry are the biggest users of intermediaries (37% of all offerings during 2009-2017) while venture capital funds use intermediaries the least (11% of all offerings during 2009-2017). There is also significant usage of intermediaries by private equity funds and

⁵² To identify the presence of an intermediary in an offering, we identify those offerings that report paying a commission and/or finder's fee. We also include cases where the CRD number of a recipient of sales compensation is reported on Form D, but no commission and/or finder's fee is paid as of the filing date of the form. Since the issuer could list intermediaries which *will be paid* compensation, we believe that including these cases accounts more accurately for the participation of intermediaries. When calculating the fees paid, however, we only included offerings with positive commission and/or finder's fee.